

REMARKS

I. Introduction

New claim 14 has been added. Claims 7 to 14 are currently pending in the present application, since claims 1 to 6 were previously canceled. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgement of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, 1449 papers, and cited references.

II. Objection to the Specification

The title has been amended herein, thereby obviating the present objection to the Specification. Withdrawal of the objection to the Specification is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Objection to Claim 13

Claim 13 has been amended herein without prejudice, thereby obviating the present objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 7 to 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 to 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of International Patent Application Publication No. WO 99/40522 ("Gonion et al.") and U.S. Patent No. 5,941,977 ("Panwar et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Gonion et al. and Panwar et al. does not render unpatentable any of new claims 7 to 10 for at least the following reasons.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must demonstrate three criteria: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest each and every limitation in the claim under examination. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claim 7, as herein amended without prejudice, relates to a method of data processing using a processor comprising a reconfigurable field of data processing cells and as recites, *inter alia*, the following:

... determining, for the field of data processing cells, configurations corresponding to a program and by running of which the program is executed; [and] determining, for each configuration, a respective maximum allowed execution runtime prior to lapse of which the respective configuration is uninterruptible ...

Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the Specification, e.g., at page 5, lines 1 to 6.

Neither Gonion et al. nor Panwar et al., whether considered alone or in combination, disclose or suggest restricting an execution runtime for a configuration of reconfigurable data processing cells.

Thus, the combination of Gonion et al. and Panwar et al. does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 7. Accordingly, the combination of Gonion et al. and Panwar et al. does not render unpatentable claim 7.

Claims 8 to 10 ultimately depend from claim 7 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 7. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Gonion et al. and Panwar et al. does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 7. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (any dependent claim that depends from a non-obvious independent claim is non-obvious).

Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 7 to 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Gonion et al., Panwar et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,860,119 (“Dockser”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Gonion et al., Panwar et al., and Dockser does not render unpatentable claim 11 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 depends from claim 7 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 7. Dockser does not correct the deficiencies noted above with respect to the combination of Gonion et al. and Panwar et al. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Gonion et al., Panwar et al., and Dockser does not render unpatentable this

dependent claim for the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 7. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this rejection of claim 11 is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 12 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Gonion et al., Panwar et al., and U.S. Patent No. 4,041,462 (“Davis et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Gonion et al., Panwar et al., and Davis et al. does not render unpatentable either of claims 12 and 13 for at least the following reasons.

Claims 12 and 13 ultimately depend from claim 7 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 7. Davis et al. do not correct the deficiencies noted above with respect to the combination of Gonion et al. and Panwar et al. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the combination of Gonion et al., Panwar et al., and Davis et al. does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for the same reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 7. *Id.*

Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 12 and 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. New Claim 14

New claim 14 has been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 14 does not add any new matter and is fully supported by the present application, including the Specification. Claim 14 ultimately depends from claim 7. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the cited references do not render unpatentable this dependent claim for at least the same reasons set forth above in support of claim 7.

VIII. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 20, 2007

By:



Michelle Carniaux
Reg. No. 36,098

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO 26646